LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
NOV 3 1964
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1964

No. 385

IRMA GROSSMAN, ET AL.,
Petitioners,

v.

JEANNETTE STUBBS and HAROLD RUGG,
Respondent.

PETITION FOR REHEARING

IRMA GROSSMAN,
pro se,
287 Avenue C.
New York, New York

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1964

No. 385

IRMA GROSSMAN, et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

JEANNETTE STUBBS and HAROLD RUGG,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Petitioner prays that this Court grant rehearing of its order of October 12, 1964 denying the petition for writ of certiorari on the following grounds:

1. Every branch of government, every large business and in every type of criminal law there is a watch-dog system to see that things are done correctly. Only in civil law there is nothing between the client and the lawyer to see that the client's every right is being protected.

2. Mrs. Grossman's suit was filed in July 1961, without her consent or permission. It was not until October that she was induced to sign papers among which may have been a retainer although she does not know what the papers she signed read. As this Court knows when the majority of the people enter a lawyer's office they are mesmerized. They tiptoe in, hat in hand, respect in their hearts for the authority of the court that these

men represent. And the lawyer does exactly as he pleases with the client, the client never knowing the difference. Case in point is Mr. Grossman who is an example of the average citizen I have spoken of. Today he stands bewildered at what has happened to us saying "But I went into an American courtroom in the United States of America, who knew the different states have different rules on the exact same type of cases". It was not for the Grossmans to know rules and regulations of the 50 States of the Union. There should have been legislation to protect the Grossmans from being devoured by unscrupulous attorneys. It was the attorneys obligation to inform the Grossmans that they had rights to the federal courts as well as New York State courts instead of coercing them into the defendant's state.

3. The majority of the nation who are law abiding citizens deserve better protection than this. It is only once in a person's life that they are involved with the courts. In that one time that they seek justice there every right must be protected.

4. From the State of New Jersey the plaintiffs can expect no aid. For if the Grossmans are right the New Jersey system is wrong. Whether the Grossmans get back their rights which were denied them is of great importance to the welfare of every citizen of the United States because if our rights are snuffed out so are theirs.

The State of New Jersey denied us due process of law first in denying us the right of an ethics hearing as we presented no papers to the ethics committee as we wanted to wait for the hearing we were entitled to. Next in denying us the right to answer the defendant's brief.

5. No amount of money can compensate severe bodily injury but whatever a lawyer gets in a case is found money. He feels no pain. Negligence lawyers deal with the insurance company as a matter of course and must consider the next case coming up. Not every case is a big one and you want to stay on the good side of the insurance company to settle. Who protects the people. No attorney sends away clients if they mean money to him.

For all of these reasons this case should be heard and if it is, legislation will be passed to protect all the people.

Respectfully submitted,

(s) IRMA GROSSMAN
287 Arcadia Ct
New York, New York